DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 392 185 EC 304 615

AUTHOR	Schrag, Judy A.
TITLE	Use of Part B Funds To Support School Reform by Nine State Education Agencies. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Alexandria, VA.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	25 Jan 96
CONTRACT	HS92015001
NOTE	41p.; Prepared by Project FORUM. For the task force final report, see ED 381 970.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Decision Making; *Disabilities; *Educational Change; *Educational Legislation; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Federal State Relationship; *Resource Allocation; School Funds; State Departments of Education; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Part B

ABSTRACT

This report analyzes the uses of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B discretionary/set-aside, administrative, and flow-through funds for school reform activities. Telephone interviews were held with state directors of special education or staff from nine state education agencies (California, New Mexico, Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Tennessee, and Florida). Findings indicated that all nine states are using Part B discretionary funds to support activities directly related to statewide school reform initiatives. Findings are detailed in text and tables for each state, concerning: (1) the extent to which students with disabilities are included within school reform efforts; (2) examples of school reform activities supported by Part B (such as changes in assessment of students with disabilities); (3) changes occurring within the states that may impact the use of Part B funds (including political, organizational, policy, and programmatic changes); and (4) recommendations related to changes in IDEA reauthorization to facilitate the use of Part B funds for school reform. These recommendations include: joint responsibility of other agencies for non-educational services; linkages with the gifted and preschool programs; reduction of time and effort in reporting requirements for split funding of personnel; and greater involvement of general education. The interview instrument and a table summarizing Part B uses for school reform are attached. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

USE OF PART B FUNDS TO SUPPORT SCHOOL REFORM BY NINE STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

by Judy A. Schrag, Ed.D.

ED 392 185

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Final Report
Year 3 Deliverable #6-3-2
Under Contract No. HS92015001
January 25, 1996

Prepared for:
ffice of Special Education Programs
Of U.S. Department of Education

Prepared by:
Project FORUM
Joy Hicks, Director

ciation of State Directors of Special Education
National Asso 1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320
Alexandria, VA 22314

EC 304015

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education (Contract No. HS92015001). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the Department should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT i

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

INTRODUCTION 1

- Background 1
- Purpose 1

METHODOLOGY 2

- Selection of Participating States 2
- Telephone Interview Instrument 2
- Telephone Interviews 2

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS 3

- Summary of Part B Uses Related to School Reform 3
- Summary of Extent to Which Students With Disabilities are Included Within School Reform Activities 4
- Examples of School Reform Activities Supported by Part B 7
- Summary of Changes Occurring Within the States That May Be Impacting The Use of Part B Funds 10
- Summary of Recommendations Related to Changes in IDEA ReAuthorization to Facilitate the Use of Part B Funds for School Reform 13

SUMMARY 16

APPENDIX A 17

- Telephone Interview Instrument 18

APPENDIX B 21

- Summary of Part B Uses for School Reform 22

ABSTRACT

Project FORUM, a contract funded by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) of the U.S. Department of Education and located at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) carries out a variety of activities that provide information needed for program improvement and that promote the utilization of research data and other information for improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The project also provides technical assistance and information on emerging issues, and convenes small work groups to gather expert input, obtain feedback, and develop conceptual frameworks related to critical topics in special education.

This analysis, conducted by Project FORUM, was performed to assist OSEP in carrying out its responsibilities related to information communication and linkages of information to changes in policies and practices. The work conducted builds on previous FORUM work carried out in its current contract with OSEP.

The report summarizes an analysis of the uses of Part B discretionary set aside, administrative, and flow through funds for school reform activities. Telephone interviews were held with state directors of special education in other state education agency (SEA) staff members from nine SEAs. Findings indicate that all nine states are using Part B discretionary funds to support activities directly related to statewide school reform initiatives.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Project FORUM acknowledges the assistance received from Kelly Henderson, Consultant, for her valuable assistance in conducting several of the telephone interviews for this study. In addition, Project FORUM extends its sincere appreciation to the following persons for their time and thoughtful responses in the telephone discussions regarding the uses of Part B funds to support direct and indirect school reform projects and activities. SEA staff interviewed provided not only a summary of these projects and activities, but also discussed changes occurring in their states that may be impacting the use of Part B funds for school reform. Persons interviewed also provided recommendations for IDEA re-authorization that might facilitate the contribution that Part B resources make on school reform in the states.

Dr. Barbara Thalacker, Administrator
Secondary and Personnel Development
California Department of Education
Sacramento, California

Mr. Bill Trant, Assistant Director
Special Education Office
New Mexico Department of Education
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Ms. Jeannnne Hagen, Chief
Bureau of Special Education
Iowa Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa

Ms. Gail Lieberman Assistant
Superintendent
Department of Special Education
Illinois State Board of Education
Springfield, Illinois

Dr. Richard Baldwin, Director
Special Education Services
Ms. Penny Zago, Consultant
Dr. Joe Gomez, Consultant
Office of Special Education
Michigan Department of Education
Lansing, Michigan

Ms. Michele Desera, Director
Bureau of Special Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Ms. Gloria Matta
Director of Management Services
Division of Special Education
Tennessee Department of Education
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Patrick Shaughnessy, Education
Consultant
Bureau of Special Education and Pupil
Personnel Services
Connecticut Department of Education
Middletown, Connecticut

Ms. Bettye Weir, Chief
Bureau of Student Services and
Exceptional Education
Florida Education Center
Tallahassee, Florida

USE OF PART B FUNDS TO SUPPORT SCHOOL REFORM BY NINE STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

INTRODUCTION

Background

Part B of the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) provides formula grant funds which are allocated to State Education Agencies (SEAs) on an annual basis. These federal funds have the following uses:

- A maximum of 5 percent may be retained by the SEA for administrative costs in carrying out Part B of the Act.
- A maximum of 20 percent may be retained by SEAs for discretionary/set aside uses such as statewide leadership projects and activities.
- A minimum of 75 percent must be flowed through to local education agencies based on local child count.

Thirty-five states participated in an inquiry recently carried out by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE). Twenty-six or approximately 74% of these states reported that more than the 75 percent of the Part B funds they received in July, 1992 was distributed to local education agencies. For these states, less than 20 percent is retained for state discretionary projects and activities. Seventeen (approximately 49%) of these states reported that they utilized discretionary funds to support school reform efforts involving students with disabilities. The mean percentage of discretionary funds utilized for school reform was 22.3.

Purpose

This Project FORUM study was designed to further explore the current uses of Part B discretionary, administrative, and flow-through funds to support school reform activities. For purposes of this inquiry, "school reform efforts" were operationally defined as those activities that both directly and indirectly relate to the State's GOALS 2000 plans and other identified statewide education reform activities. The time frame selected for use of funds was "current year." Nine state directors of special education and/or their designated staff members were interviewed by telephone ragarding the specific uses of administrative, discretionary or set-aside, and flow-through Part B funds for school reform were identified and summarized. Other issues related to the use of Part B funds were also discussed. This report contains the findings from this telephone survey.

METHODOLOGY

Selection of Participating States

SEAs selected for telephone interviews were chosen from among those that reported using Part B discretionary funds in the previously- referenced NASDSE survey. In addition, geographic distribution and size were considered in the selection of participating states. A telephone interview was conducted personnel from the following SEAs: California, New Mexico, Iowa, Illinois, Michigan, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Florida.

Telephone Interview Instrument

The telephone interview instrument utilized in this study was developed with the help of a communication panel of four state directors of special education and one SEA staff member. Revisions were made to the draft instrument based on feedback from the communication panel. The interview instrument can be found in Appendix A.

Telephone Interviews

A telephone call was made to each of the nine state directors of special education requesting their participation in this study, and following their agreement, the telephone interview instrument was faxed to them. To allow time for review of the questions and information requested, a telephone interview appointment was scheduled at least a week later. All nine SEA telephone interviews were held during March and April, 1995.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Summary of Part B Uses Related to School Reform

The percentage of Part B Funds retained for discretionary use ranged from 0 to 20. Connecticut, Florida and Iowa retained the most at 20%. This information is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Percentage of Part B Funds Retained for Discretionary Use

STATE	PERCENTAGE
California	0% (Legislative Requirement)
New Mexico	4%
Iowa	20%
Illinois	8.25%
Michigan	13%
Pennsylvania	13%
Connecticut	20%
Tennessee	15%
Florida	20%

SEA representatives were also asked to estimate the percentage of the total current Part B budget that is being used to support school reform efforts. Twenty percent or more of administrative funds were utilized by four SEAs for school reform, compared to the other five SEAs that reported the use of 20 percent or more of discretionary funds. Three of the nine SEAs reported that LEAs utilized from one to five percent of their flow-through funds for school reform activities. It should be noted that all SEAs interviewed indicated that information about the use of flow-through funds for school reform efforts was, at best, a guess or estimate and that information about specific uses of flow through funds is not systematically gathered within these nine SEAs. A summary of this information is found in Table 2.

Table 2

Estimated Percentages of the Total Current Part B Funds Used to Support School Reform

ADMINISTRATIVE	**1-5%**	**6-10%**	**11-15%**	**16-20%**	**+20%**
California	x				
New Mexico					x
Iowa					x
Illinois					x
Michigan			x		
Pennsylvania	x				
Connecticut	x				
Tennessee	x				
Florida					x
DISCRETIONARY	**1-5%**	**6-10%**	**11-15%**	**16-20%**	**+20%**
California	None				
New Mexico					x
Iowa					x
Illinois					x
Michigan	x				
Pennsylvania					x
Connecticut			x		
Tennessee				x	
Florida					x
FLOW THROUGH	**1-5%**	**6-10%**	**11-15%**	**16-20%**	**+20%**
California					
New Mexico				X	
Iowa	X				
Illinois					
Michigan*					
Pennsylvania					X
Connecticut	X	(used primarily for LEA personnel)			
Tennessee	X				
Florida*					

* information not collected or unknown to respondent

Summary of Extent to Which Students With Disabilities are Included Within State School Reform Efforts

The nine SEA representatives were asked to describe the extent to which a focus on students with disabilities is included within the State's overall school reform efforts. Their responses are summarized below:

California

California reform efforts are intended to included all students, including students with disabilities. SEA special education staff have prioritized the use of their administrative and discretionary funds for various school reform activities such as supporting research, development, and demonstration programs in the area of assessment of students with disabilities. The SEA special education staff have also supported projects that involve standards development and improved student outcomes. SEA special education staff have participated in education reform efforts by participating on Goals 2000 committees.

New Mexico

School reform in New Mexico is directed at all students. The SEA is guided by four major initiatives:

- *Consolidating Initiatives for Tomorrow's Education - A Student Centered Policy Framework for System-wide Educational Change in New Mexico* is a State Board of Education long range planning approach to school reform in the state which provides policy guidance to the State Board and the SEA.

- *Educational Plan for Student Success* is a local level educational improvement planning process which utilizes on-site accreditation/monitoring information to develop a long range, student-results oriented educational improvement planning process upon which schools will be accredited by the State Board.

- *New Mexico Goals 2000 State Plan* incorporates the above two major initiatives along with several other systemic changes initiatives a major policy guiding mechanism addressing school reform in the state.

- Consortium on Inclusive Education is a project awarded to the State Board from the National Association of State Boards of Education which addresses and integrates school reform with a unified system of education and inclusive educational practice.

These initiatives are each integrated and guided by several process elements: multi-

representiveness; gender, ethnic, and ability-diversity; family-school-community partnership/empowerment; results orientation for students; and accountability through multiple assessment strategies.

Iowa

School reform in Iowa is occurring more at the local than the state level. There are no state standards or state assessment requirements. Special education staff, however, are involved in planning at the SEA level in efforts such as encouraging local reform and increasing coordination across programs at the state and local level (e.g., horizontal teams within the SEA and community planning). The SEA special education staff have not been specifically involved in Goals 2000 and School to Work activities. At the state level, a reform initiative across special education and vocational rehabilitation has been initiated. This collaborative initiative is focused on transition at the secondary level.

Illinois

Students with disabilities are included within the statewide Illinois Goal Assessment Program (IGAP). This reform initiative assesses various grades in six fundamental learning areas; grade 3 in reading and writing and grade 4 in science and social studies. If a student cannot participate in the IGAP with or without accommodations, alternative assessment is not provided. Every child gets a score, but all scores may not be included in the overall reporting process. Local assessments must also include these students in the benchmark grades.

School districts have to account for all students, including those with disabilities and other at-risk conditions, during the building-level state quality review process.

Michigan

In the early 1990's, the Michigan legislature passed several education reform bills including those related to outcomes, core curriculum, and standards. A subsection of their core curriculum legislation allowed the State Board of Education to develop an alternative curriculum for students with disabilities, but they chose not to. In addition, the legislation required that specialized school programs have the same requirements as other general education programs. While students with disabilities were not strongly considered in developing or implementing general education reform efforts, Michigan legislation does refer to "all" students.

Pennsylvania

Consistent with Goals 2000, Pennsylvania's education reform process involves all students, including those with disabilities. All students have the opportunity to learn and succeed.

In addition to promising practices of inclusion and assistive technology, Pennsylvania has enacted legislation supporting 53 student learning outcomes as well as the instructional support program to assist all students in meeting these student learning outcomes. Although the development of 53 student learning outcomes was primarily a general education initiative, some Part B discretionary funds have been used to apply outcomes to students with disabilities. The general education regulations were revised in 1992 to place a high emphasis on accountability of teachers and students, including performance-based graduation units (e.g., the Carnegie Unit was dropped). These changes impacted all students, including those with disabilities. The major special education supported initiative in Pennsylvania is the Instructional Support System of Pennsylvania (ISSP), which encompasses a great variety of personnel, parent involvement, assistive technology, and other support programs. Part B discretionary and administrative funds support these ISSP programs that are intended to build capacity to ensure success for all students within the context of local schools and communities.

Tennessee

The Education Improvement Act and various statewide education reform initiatives involve all students, including those with disabilities. Special education personnel at the state and local level have been involved in reform planning efforts including task forces and committees. An example of a specific project involving students with disabilities that is compatible with overall education reform efforts is "Make A Difference". This project provides assistance to school personnel in using strategies to deal with children with behavioral disabilities.

Connecticut

Education reform has involved all students and has focused on improving teaching, learning, and student achievement. The Connecticut Mastery Test is given to all students at the 4th, 6th, and 8th grade. A longitudinal study has recently been completed to determine the success of special education students on these tests. A "Position Statement on the Education of Students With Disabilities" has been developed that embraces the expectation that educational outcomes for all Connecticut children, including those receiving special education services, will reflect high standards.

Florida

When Florida's Blueprint 2000 began, there was the perception that students with disabilities were not specifically included. However, Florida's Accountability Commission affirmed that, in terms of school improvement, "all means all". A number of efforts have been initiated to involve students with disabilities. For example, the work of the State Accountability Commission involves all students, including their efforts to identify a state assessment system.

Examples of Reform Activities Supported by Part B

Table 3, below, provides a summary of the number of states that reported using discretionary/set aside, administrative, and flow-through Part B funds for various school reform projects and activities. At least 7 of the 9 states are utilizing discretionary Part B funds to support six school reform activities (related to changes in assessment, a statewide school reform initiative, staff development for general education personnel, interagency coordination activities, parental involvement initiatives, and inclusion projects). In addition, at least 7 of the 9 states are utilizing administrative Part B funds to support five school reform activities (related to standards for students with disabilities; activities that focus on improved outcomes for students with disabilities; activities that relate to increased coordination between special education, Chapter 2, other support programs, and general education; parental involvement initiatives; and special studies).

TABLE 3

Number Of States Utilizing Discretionary/Set Aside, Administrative, And Flow Through Part B Funds For School Reform Activities

SCHOOL REFORM ACTIVITY	DISCRETIONARY	ADMINISTRATIVE	FLOW-THROUGH
Activities related to changes in assessment of students with disabilities	7	6	4
Projects or activities that focus on standards for students with disabilities	4	8	3
Projects or activities that specifically focus on improved outcomes for students with disabilities	5	7	4
Activities related to the State's Goals 2000 plan	3	6	2
Activities directly related to a statewide school reform initiative	9	4	3
Support for staff development for general education personnel (teachers or principals) to work with students with disabilities	7	5	6
Support for pre-service training projects focused on increasing the skills of general education personnel to work with students with disabilities.	6	4	3
Interagency coordination activities	7	6	7
Programs, projects, or activities that relate to increased coordination between special education, Chapter 1, other support programs, and general education.	4	9	2
Parental involvement initiatives	7	7	4
Special studies	5	7	4
Support of projects that support inclusion of students with disabilities in general education	7	6	6

A number of exciting direct and indirect school reform efforts involving students with disabilities are being supported with Part B discretionary or set aside funds within the nine SEAs. As reported by the nine SEA representatives these activities included direct involvement in Goals 2000 planning in the following ways:

- standard setting
- statewide assessment activities to special studies involving funding changes
- statewide changes in the delivery of services to students with disabilities
- parent support networks

Examples of Part B-supported reform activities vary across states. Many activities utilize discretionary/set aside and administrative funds to support alternative assessment and the design of student outcomes and standards for all students, including those with disabilities. New Mexico has provided Part B discretionary/set aside funds to support projects exploring alternative assessment beyond traditional standardized methods. The Illinois SEA currently requires each LEA to utilize 50% of their Part B flow-through funds for staff development such as training regarding the Illinois Goal Assessment Program. Administrative Part B funds have been used by Michigan to support the development of guidelines regarding testing accommodations for students with disabilities within the Michigan Education Assessment Program. Connecticut utilized Part B administrative funds to support a recent longitudinal evaluation study of the success of special education students at the 4th, 6th, and 8th grade levels on the Connecticut Mastery Test, given to all Connecticut students. Connecticut also utilizes discretionary/set aside funds to support an Early Intervention Project that utilizes curriculum-based assessment. Within Florida, administrative and discretionary/set aside Part B funds are used to carry out assessments for students with disabilities, including modifications and accommodations as a part of the Blueprint 2000 initiative.

In the reform area that focuses on standards for all students, including those with disabilities, Michigan has used administrative funds to support field-based identification of outcomes statements for what students with disabilities should know and be able to do. Local education agencies are then encouraged to adopt these outcome expectations. Connecticut invested administrative and discretionary/set aside funds in an effort to develop a position paper which calls for the development of high educational outcomes for all students, including those with disabilities. Tennessee's administrative funds support special education staff participation in a task force examining improved student outcomes.

California reported the use of Part B discretionary set aside funds to support projects that are particularly focused on improved outcomes for students with disabilities including Special EDGE, the Workability Grant, and the Special Education Interagency Transition Grant. The New Mexico respondent indicated that SEA staff funded with Part B administrative funds have participated on various committees within the state focused on improved outcomes for all

students, including those with disabilities. Iowa has utilized discretionary/set aside, administrative, and flow-through Part B funds to carry out statewide efforts to improve outcomes for students with disabilities through their Renewed Service Delivery System. These activities are compatible with overall school reform efforts. The Pennsylvania legislature identified 53 learning outcomes. Some Part B funds have been utilized by the SEA to apply these outcomes to students with disabilities. Similarly, the Tennessee SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds have participated on committees and a task force related to improved student outcomes. Florida's Strategic Plan for the Education of Exceptional Students is focused on better outcomes for students with disabilities. All IDEA-funded projects and activities must be related to this Plan.

States involved in this study have devoted Part B resources to insuring SEA special education personnel involvement in the overall Goals 2000 effort. Iowa, California, New Mexico, and Illinois are among those who have used administrative funds to support active special education staff involvement in state-level Goals 2000 planning and implementation efforts.

Across the states interviewed, staff development efforts supported by Part B administrative and/or discretionary/set aside funds are assisting general education personnel to more effectively address the needs of diverse learners. Florida has utilized Part B administrative and discretionary set aside funds to initiate a Collaborative Training Initiative in which teachers of special and general education are trained together to provide additional tools for student diversity. New Mexico, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut are investing Part B resources to develop and implement pre-referral building level teams that are designed to provide instructional intervention assistance to general education teachers who serve students at-risk of referral to special education. Several states, Tennessee and Iowa, support professional development activities which help general educators better manage student behavior.

The nine SEAs participating in this study also identified other activities directly or indirectly related to statewide education reform in areas such as pre-service training for general education personnel; interagency coordination; coordination between special education, Chapter 1, other support programs, and general education; parental involvement, pre-referral intervention and special studies; and inclusion. In the area of staff development, California has utilized discretionary/set aside and flow-through funds to support training of local personnel through the California Educational Innovations Institutions (CEI). The Iowa Behavioral Initiative, supported by Part B funds, has provided training for general education classroom teachers and principals. School-based teams in Illinois are provided in-depth training in alternative service delivery for students with disabilities. Pennsylvania's Instructional Support Team Project, supported by discretionary/set aside and flow-through Part B funds, provides similar training for classroom teachers, principals, and other educators.

Although extensive pre-service training projects supported by Part B funds were not reported by the nine participating SEAs, New Mexico indicated that Part B discretionary/set aside funds are combined with Part D training funds to support pre-service training within the five state universities. Connecticut also reported that discretionary/set aside funding supports an interdisciplinary program across Connecticut's institutions of higher education on best practices in early intervention, special education, and inclusive education using institutes and distance learning technology. Part B administrative, discretionary/set aside, and flow-through funds have also supported the development of university/school district regional partnerships in Florida to identify pre-service training needs.

All nine SEAs participating in this study cited examples of interagency coordination efforts being supported by Part B administrative, discretionary, or flow-through funds. For example, the Florida SEA is supporting 18 Diagnostic Learning Resource Centers throughout the state that are involved efforts to promote and encourage interagency coordination. The Florida Shared Services Network also has an interagency focus to assist school districts in bringing together a Kids Network. The Florida SEA has also implemented an Integrated Service Delivery Project that is exploring expanded ways of providing student support services. The New Mexico SEA has utilized Part B administrative funds to initiate coordination accreditation procedures which is a blend of monitoring and other activities across programs, including special education. Iowa has utilized all three sources of Part B funds to support efforts to increase program coordination at the state and local level. The Florida, Tennessee, Connecticut, Michigan, and California SEA special education staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate in Department-wide efforts to increase coordination across special education, Chapter 1, other support programs, and general education.

Appendix B provides a detailed summary of information obtained during the SEA telephone interviews regarding these and other uses of Part B funds for school reform during the current school/fiscal year including parental involvement initiatives, special studies, and initiatives to support inclusion of students with disabilities in general education/unified systems of service delivery.

Summary of Changes Occurring Within the States That May Impact the Use of Part B Funds

State directors of special education or other staff members participating in this study were also asked to describe current events occurring in their state that could impact the use of Part B funds for school reform; e.g., recent changes in Governor, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and/or other key policy makers as a result of the general election; SEA organizational changes; or new state reform initiatives. Current events with potential impact were identified by all nine states. Political changes since the November, 1994 election included movement toward

more local flexibility, increased program collaboration, and/or re-organization of SEAs to reflect greater program integration and coordination. Respondents were not certain, however, whether these events will have an impact on the uses of Part B funds. The following is a summary of information received.

California

California has a legislative requirement that prevents the state from retaining more than $1.117 million Part B funds at the state level for leadership activities.

As of January, 1995, California has a newly-elected Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Superintendent created a Children, Youth, and Family Services Branch which takes responsibility for a number of programs previously in other areas of the Department (including child development, child nutrition, interagency children and youth services). The Special Education Division's reorganization parallels the curriculum and reorganization efforts in general education. Specifically, within special education, there is a one-year old organizational change in place: Early Education (health is the lead agency); Elementary and Specialized Services; Secondary and Personnel Development; and three administrative units, Management and Coordination (budget); Research, Evaluation, and Outcomes (policy and student outcomes); and Quality Assurances (monitoring).

New Mexico

New Mexico has been involved in some significant deregulation efforts during the past 3-4 years. The impact of these efforts on the use of Part B funds is illustrated by the following:

- Joint School Accreditation: Teams from the SEA representing all state/federal and program/budget functions visit districts in a unified fashion to conduct on-site reviews of local agencies and schools. The team completes a joint, unified report which is utilized along with local information to develop the local improvement plan - Educational Plan for Student Success.

- State Department of Education Program Budget Review: Collaborative teams, representing fiscal and program elements of the agency, review and approve all local operational budgets annually. This process attempts to structure the budgets approval process in a way that is driven by educational reform initiatives and school improvement goals.

- Single Federal Plan: State and local representatives are in the process of developing both a single local plan and a single state plan procedure for all federal and categorical revenue which support educational reform initiatives identified earlier. Several districts will pilot this procedure in 1995-1996.

Additionally, other factors that may impact the use of Part B funds are the recent election resulting in changes in administration and the introduction of a bill to abolish the State Board of Education and replace it with a cabinet secretary for education.

Iowa

Iowa has a new Education Chief; however, present changes do not appear to be impacting the use of Part B funds. Iowa is on record supporting the concept of block granting, with the caveat of opposing overall reductions in funds. The Governor has called for eliminating "unnecessary" regulations. The SEA is in a planning year to look at areas where regulations might be reduced.

Illinois

The Illinois SEA has recently restructured into seven Centers for Educational Leadership to support education reform, customer services, and improved education. One of the intents of restructuring is to better coordinate programs such as accountability and early childhood. Functions previously in the Special Education department have been dispersed to at least five of the seven Centers. It is not known if these organizational changes will impact the use of Part B funds. In 1993, a state restriction regarding the use of 8.25 percent of Part B discretionary/set aside funds for Room and Board has changed permitting funding of community-based wrap-around services from the pool of funds. This change can result in more flexibility. In addition, as Part B is consolidated with the 89-313 state operated program funds, there may be additional flexibility with the use of administrative or discretionary funds.

Michigan

There have been a number of political changes since November, 1994 when the Republican Governor was re-elected. Both Houses and the State Board of Education have a Republican majority. The structure of the SEA and Office of Special Education has remained the same, but there are efforts to provide more control to LEAs, to implement schools of choice, and to undo some mandates. Special education, along with the rest of the Education Department programs, may be impacted by these changes.

Pennsylvania

A new Governor was elected in November, 1994, the first Republican Governor in eight years. Both legislative Houses are Republican. Priorities include less regulation, less bureaucracy, and more local control. A new Secretary of Education has been appointed. At this point, the future re-organization of the SEA is unclear, as well as the impact of these changes on the use of Part B.

Connecticut

Connecticut has a newly-elected governor. Legislative provisions also require that five new members must be appointed to the State Board of Education, and a new Commissioner of Education must be appointed. The Governor's priorities include efforts to increase flexibility, collaboration and consolidation of programs and finances. The legislature is currently reviewing a school finance reform bill that would eliminate special education aid and distribute all state education aid through a general education cost-sharing grant.

Tennessee

Tennessee has a new Republican Governor and a new Commissioner. The SEA has been re-organized and site-based management is being emphasized. These do not seem to be changes however, that will impact the use of Part B funds.

Florida

Under a new Republican Commissioner of Education, the Florida SEA is currently looking at all state rules with a priority toward local flexibility. Political changes have resulted in the loss of staff , including special education (approximately 25% cut), which may result in increased contracting for certain functions. Pre-K programs have been included within a block grant in preliminary legislative recommendations. There is also legislative interest in capping funding for certain exceptional education programs (specific learning disabilities, emotionally handicapped, and gifted). There is a feeling at the local level that more Part B funds should be sent to LEAs. This may impact the current 20 percent discretionary used at the state level.

Summary of Recommendations Related to Changes in IDEA Re-Authorization to Facilitate the Use of Part B Funds for School Reform

SEA respondents were also asked to discuss recommendations related to IDEA re-authorization that could facilitate the use of Part B funds for school reform. Because Part B funds are utilized to supplement state and local funds for special education, IDEA re-authorization recommendations noted by the respondents were broad in scope. Following is a summary of the responses received by the nine SEAs.

California

The IDEA should allow SEAs to utilize up to 15% discretionary set-aside funds for state leadership activities. Joint responsibility of other agencies for non-educational services should be emphasized. The SEA's burden for services in juvenile corrections should be relieved by having

other lead agencies become responsible.

New Mexico

IDEA should allow collaborative uses of Part B administrative funds with other administrative funds such as gifted and 313 (state operated program), and preschool Section 619 funds to carry out specific school reform activities. Changes should be made that would allow for more coordination and flexibility across Part B and preschool Section 619 funds since there are artificial lines between these programs. In doing so, broader and more flexible audit structures should be allowed across these programs to account for program expenditures. Part B remains an important funding source to support statewide innovation and program development.

Iowa

There is a need for broad federal interpretation that would allow incidental benefits across special education and other support programs. The allowable uses of Part B should not be narrowed within IDEA re-authorization. IDEA re-authorization should move away from the term "discretionary" because this miscommunicates the importance of these funds and communicates that these funds are optional. IDEA re-authorization should continue to keep the Part B administrative, discretionary/set aside and flow-through structure in place. OSEP should also interpret Part B as broadly and flexibly as possible. For example, OSEP should not require that states label students for funding purposes. Continued use of Part B administrative funds are critical since very few SEA staff are currently funded with state or other funds. Innovative and visionary initiatives and activities within Iowa during the past several years have been possible because of Part B administrative and discretionary funds.

Illinois

No specific recommendations were made on changes to IDEA, including funding. Federal rules are of more concern than the law itself. There has been a sufficient amount of flexibility within IDEA to support needed initiatives, projects, and efforts within Illinois.

Michigan

Michigan supports proposed changes in IDEA funding to a census funding formula. Related to funding, however, Michigan does not support IDEA changes that would allow blending of funds across programs, including Part B, because the result could be the loss of advocacy for students with disabilities if all resources are combined. IDEA re-authorization should delete three-year re-evaluation requirements. Evaluation should, rather, be ongoing. Finally, there is too much federally-required paperwork. Changes within IDEA should allow for additional flexibility to allow States to reduce paperwork requirements at the state and local levels.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania supports a move toward block grants which would roll all Part B funds into one pot of money with required protections that students with disabilities are served and that their rights are protected. Discretionary grant funding should be maintained. Use of mediation in each state should be required for those parents who choose to mediate. Reimbursement for attorneys' fees should be reduced. Provisions should be added for the qualitative assessment of special education; e.g., an annual study of program effectiveness with clear results data. Finally, IDEA re-authorization should move away from disability categories--support all students.

Connecticut

The due process system should change to focus on limited and pre-defined issues, operate within a defined time frame, and limit attorney's fees to the hearing and court stages, assuming the parent prevails at those levels. The surrogate parent requirements should change to allow employees of social service agencies to serve as surrogate parents. Federal monitoring of state IDEA programs should be changed to focus on outcomes, rather than on process. State plan reviews, and federal monitoring procedures should be combined for efficiency. The three-year re-evaluation process should be changed so that a repeat of the initial evaluation is not required. IDEA re-authorization should support flexibility at the state and local levels. Congress should fund IDEA at the 40% level.

Tennessee

Flexibility in the use of Part B funds should be increased to support greater involvement of general education.

Florida

IDEA re-authorization should add provisions that would allow a designated amount of Part B funds to be co-mingled with other funds to support systemic school reform as long as the rights of students with disabilities are protected. In addition, IDEA re-authorization should clarify that detailed time and effort logs are not needed by state and local education agencies that are split funding personnel across Part B and other federal fund sources.

SUMMARY

Telephone interviews were held with nine state directors of special education or their designated staff members to identify current uses of Part B discretionary/set aside, administrative and flow-through funds to support school reform efforts. All nine states are using Part B discretionary funds to support activities directly related to statewide school reform initiative(s). These activities include changes in assessment of students with disabilities, projects that focus on standards for students with disabilities, efforts related to the state Goals 2000 plan, or specific projects that focus on improved outcomes for students with disabilities. In addition, all nine states are using Part B administrative funds to support programs, projects, or activities related to increased coordination between special education, Chapter 1, other support programs, and general education. Appendix B provides descriptions of a rich and varied array of direct and indirect school reform projects, initiatives, and activities involving students with disabilities that are supported by Part B administrative, discretionary, and flow-through funds.

Representatives from the participating states also reported a number of political, organizational, policy, and programmatic changes occurring within their states that may impact the way Part B funds are utilized. These changes included the election of new governors and the election or appointment of new chief state school officers with specific emphasis on initiatives and priorities related to local control, rule reduction, increased program and fiscal flexibility, and expanded coordination and collaboration across programs and personnel.

The nine SEA respondents also provided some recommendations for re-authorization of IDEA that could facilitate or impact on the use of Part B funds for school reform. Several states recommended changes that would increase the flexibility and collaborative uses of Part B funds to support systemic reform such as:

- joint responsibility of other agencies for non-educational services,
- linkages with the gifted and the preschool/infant and toddler program;
- broader interpretation of incidental benefits;
- limitations on reimbursement for attorney's fees;
- reduction of time and effort reporting requirements for split funding of personnel;
- and greater involvement of general education.

There was not consensus on whether states should be allowed to co-mingle or blend Part B funds with other funds to support school reform, as long as the rights of students with disabilities are protected.

APPENDIX A

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

Use of Part B Funds for School Reform Activities

Telephone Interview Form

The purpose of this telephone interview is to gather information from nine selected states regarding the use of Part B funds to support school reform activities. The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) allows for the following uses of Part B funds: 5% for administration, 20% for discretionary/set aside funds, and 75% flow through funds This survey gathers information regarding all three uses of Part B funds.

Within this interview, school reform is operationally defined as those activities that both directly and indirectly relate to an identified statewide general education reform initiative, the State's GOALS 2000 plan, and/or an identified special education initiative or effort that directly or indirectly relates to education reform in the State.

1. What percentage of discretionary/set aside funds do you retain to be used for state initiatives or projects?

2. Briefly describe the extent to which a focus on students with disabilities is included within your State's school reform efforts.

3. Are you using Part B discretionary/set aside funds to support school reform activities during the current fiscal year (1994-1995)? Please check those that apply on the following chart, either descretionary/set aside funds, administrative (including SEA staff time), or flow-through:

4. **Briefly describe the school reform activities supported by Part B that were checked above.**

5. **What is the estimated percentage of your total Part B budget for this year that are being used to support school reform efforts checked above (please check appropriate range):**

	1-5%	6-10%	11-15%	16-20%	+20%
Administrative	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Discretionary/Set Aside	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Flow-Through	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

6. Please describe any Part B supported school reform initiative, project, or activity that you are planning, but that has not yet been initiated.

7. Please describe any activities occurring in your state that are currently or potentially may be impacting your use of Part B funds for school reform (e.g., move toward more local flexibility, re-organization of the SEA, de-regulation, priorities of new Chief or Governor, etc.).

8. Do you have any recommendations related to changes in IDEA re-authorization that could facilitate the use of Part B funds for school reform activities? If so, briefly describe.

9. Do you have any other comments regarding the use of Part B funds for school reform activities?

Part B Funds

Discretionary	Administrative	Flow-through	School Reform Activity
❑	❑	❑	Activities related to changes in assessment of students with disabilities
❑	❑	❑	Projects or activities that focus on standards for students with disabilities
❑	❑	❑	Projects or activities that specifically focus on improved outcomes for students with disabilities
❑	❑	❑	Activities related to the State's GOALS 2000 plan
❑	❑	❑	Activities directly related to a statewide school reform initiative
❑	❑	❑	Support for staff development for general education personnel (teachers or principals) to work with students with disabilities
❑	❑	❑	Support for pre-service training projects focused on increasing the skills of general education personnel to work with students with disabilities
❑	❑	❑	Interagency coordination activities
❑	❑	❑	Programs, projects, or activities that relate to increased coordination between special education, Chapter 2, other support programs, and general education
❑	❑	❑	Parental involvement initiatives
❑	❑	❑	Studies of the state special education funding system, state policies regarding pre-referral intervention, coordination between general and special education, inclusion, etc.
❑	❑	❑	Support of project that support inclusion of students with disabilities in general education
❑	❑	❑	Support of Technology Projects
			Other (please list)
❑	❑	❑	_____
❑	❑	❑	_____
❑	❑	❑	_____

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF PART B USES FOR SCHOOL REFORM

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Activities related to changes in assessment of students with disabilities				
STATES	DISCR	ADMIN	FLOW	EXAMPLES
California		x		Part B administrative funds support research, development, and demonstration programs. Administrative funds also partially support training of local personnel through California Educational Innovations Institutions (CEII), including the topic of assessment.
New Mexico	x	x		The SEA is supporting projects that are exploring alternative assessment as part of special education assessment/reassessment. Currently developing technical assistance documents in the area of assessment which addresses a broader range of assessment procedures beyond standardized assessment.
Iowa	x	x	x	Iowa has carried out major initiatives in the area of problem solving assessment. Past and current activities have been supported with administrative (staff involvement), discretionary, and flow through funds.
Illinois	x	x	x	The SEA requires each LEA to utilize 5% of their flow-through funds for staff development. Some could be used for training regarding the Illinois Goal Assessment Program or local assessments. The Special Education Leadership Academy Board determines topics for training, including assessment for regional delivery. SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds facilitate various assessment leadership activities such as providing guidance regarding accommodations and alternative assessment strategies.
Michigan		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate in interdepartmental teams/committees dealing with school reform. Within the Michigan Education Assessment Program, standardized tests are given at grades 4, 7 ,and 10 in reading and math, and grades 4, 8, and 11 in science. Guidelines have been developed regarding testing accommodations for students with disabilities.
Pennsylvania	x		x	Students with disabilities participate in statewide standardized assessment procedures. Pennsylvania state policies have a high emphasis on accountability of teachers and students including performance-based graduation units (dropped Carnegie unit). These policies apply to all, including students with disabilities. A major special education supported initiative is the Instructional Support System of Pennsylvania (ISSP), which builds capacity to ensure success for all children, including those with disabilities. Part B discretionary funds support field-based ISSP training and support initiatives.
Tennessee	x		x	Part B discretionary funds provide assistance to support high cost assessment needs. Workshops are also provided in the area of assessment.
Connecticut	x			Connecticut recently completed a longitudinal evaluation study of the success of special education students at the 4th, 6th and 8th grade levels, utilizing the results of the Connecticut Mastery Test given to all Connecticut students. Results of that study will shortly become available. Discretionary funds support an Early Intervention Project that focuses on determining appropriate curriculum matches through curriculum-based assessment and appropriate instructional interventions. Support is provided to the CT Software Evaluation Network in Special Education.
Florida	x	x		Goal 3, Blueprint 2000 relates to student assessment. Three assessment levels are implemented: 1). Same assessment standards are applied to all, but accommodations are provided; 2). Full-time special education students have the same standards, but the focus is on life skills; and 3). The more involved students such as medically fragile have a more passive participation in which they participate in some activities, but do not necessarily reach the same outcomes (a participation level). In conjunction with Blueprint 2000, Part B funds support a major development effort, the "Performance Assessment System for Students With Disabilities".

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Projects or activities that focus on standards for students with disabilities				
STATES	**DISCR**	**ADMIN**	**FLOW**	**EXAMPLES**
California		x	x	The SEA supports projects that involve standards development and student outcomes
New Mexico		x		SEA staff funded by Part B administrative funds participate on various committees focused on standard setting for all students.
Iowa	x	x	x	Past and current statewide Renewed Service Delivery System initiatives and activities have been focused on higher standards for students with disabilities. These efforts have been supported by all three Part B funding sources.
Illinois		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate on a Steering Committee for the Illinois Academic Standards Project.
Michigan		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate in activities related to the core curriculum for all students.
Pennsylvania	x		x	
Tennessee		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate on committees and task forces focused on student standards.
Connecticut	x	x		The Connecticut State Board of Education recently adopted a position paper entitled "Position Statement on the Education of Students With Disabilities." That position paper calls for a unified and coordinated educational system which embraces the expectation that educational outcomes for all Connecticut children, including those receiving special education services, will reflect high standards.
Florida	x	x		Discretionary and administrative Part B funds are used to support projects or activities that involve standards for students with disabilities (see previous item).

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Projects or activities that specifically focus on improved outcomes for students with disabilities.				
STATES	**DISCR**	**ADMIN**	**FLOW**	**EXAMPLES**
California		x	x	Some LEAs are using models which are prevention oriented and which focus on improved outcomes for students with disabilities. These projects include the Deaf-Blind Grant, Workability Grant, Special Education Interagency Transition Grant, Special EDGE, etc. California is implementing other projects supported partially by Part B that are focused on improved outcomes for students with disabilities.
New Mexico		x		SEA staff funded with Part B administrative funds have on-going participation on various committees.
Iowa	x	x	x	Past and current statewide Renewed Service Delivery System initiatives and activities have been focused on higher standards for students with disabilities. These efforts have been supported by all three Part B funding sources. Another statewide initiative focused on improved outcomes for students with disabilities related to aggregating data provided in the use of IEPs, "Student Improvement as Job #1."
Illinois	x	x	x	The SEA has not initiated an initiative specifically focused on improved academic outcomes for students with disabilities. We have examined outcomes for supported employment, for transition, and for early intervention.
Michigan		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate in efforts related to core curriculum and student expectations. The State continues to support an outcomes approach in special education based on previous work done with field based participation to identify outcomes regarding what students with disabilities across grade levels should know and can do. These expectations/outcomes are not mandated by LEAs, but they are encouraged to utilized them.
Pennsylvania	x		x	Discretionary and flow-through funds are utilized for projects related to Preparation for Adult Life. The Pennsylvania legislature developed 53 learning outcomes. Some discretionary funds have been used to apply these outcomes to students with disabilities. Part B discretionary support of ISSP initiatives are focused on improving outcomes for students with disabilities.
Tennessee		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate on committees and a task force related to improved student outcomes.
Connecticut	x			Discretionary funding supports a comprehensive program of training and technical assistance to school districts regarding effective curriculum adaptations and instructional modifications for students with disabilities and those at-risk. Support is provided to school districts to implement early intervention mental health programs.
Florida	x	x		All IDEA-funded projects and activities are carried out in the context of Florida's *Strategic Plan for the Education of Exceptional Students*, which has the following objectives: o 100% of all students with exceptionalities will graduate; o 100% of exceptional students will achieve 100% of their personal goals. o 100% of all students with exceptionalities within three months of graduation, will by choice be employed, involved in post secondary education, participate in an agency training or development program, and/or be receiving agency services; and o all individuals with exceptionalities will successfully achieve full inclusion within their community.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Activities related to the State's Goals 2000 Plan				
STATES	**DISCR**	**ADMIN**	**FLOW**	**EXAMPLES**
California		x	x	SEA staff have participated on Goals 2000 Committees. LEAs have also contributed personnel costs to these efforts.
New Mexico	x	x		SEA staff have participated on Goals 2000 Committees. SEA staff have also presented various issues related to students with disabilities on various panels and subgroups.
Iowa		x		The State Director of Special Education participates in bi-weekly meetings of the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education which often relate to the state's Goals 2000 planning grant and discussions of Iowa's future role in Goals 2000.
Illinois		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds have been active participants in Goals 2000 planning efforts.
Michigan		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate on the SEA Goals 2000 Coordinating Team. This Team has been instrumental in coordinating Michigan's Goals 2000 efforts, including the Goals 2000 Grant Program and Michigan's Improvement Plan.
Pennsylvania	x		x	
Tennessee				
Connecticut	x			Personnel from the Bureau of Special Education and Pupil Services are assigned to the Deputy Commissioner's task force relating to Departmental Goals 2000 planning, a state-wide school reform effort.
Florida		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate in the overall Accountability Commission, as well as state committees related to the planning/implementation of Goals 2000 activities/Blueprint 2000, including development of a state assessment system, curriculum framework development, and issues related to increasing standards for all.

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Activities directly related to a statewide school reform initiative				
STATES	**DISCR**	**ADMIN**	**FLOW**	**EXAMPLES**
California		x		SEA staff have participated in the development of Guides and Frameworks, as well as specific grade level initiatives.
New Mexico	x	x		Discretionary funds have supported activities related to a unified, single system of education. Projects funded have had to document how the project activities relate or tie to this priority. SEA staff, supported by Part B administrative funds facilitate and manage these discretionary projects.
Iowa	x	x	x	The statewide Iowa Behavioral Initiative involves the training of school-wide teams, representing general and special education and Youth Services, to plan strategies to deal with diverse behaviors. Part B discretionary funding has been provided to six sites. Next year, six more sites will be added. Leadership within the 15 Area Education Agencies (AEAs) have supported this effort.
Illinois	x	x	x	Part B Federal funds have been utilized to support the involvement of students with disabilities in the statewide Quality Review process and the Illinois Goal Assessment Program/local assessments.
Michigan	x	x		Although not specifically referred to as education reform, ongoing efforts such as the mediation project, technology activities, and the communication center are supported to provide better outcomes for students with disabilities. Michigan's Systems Change Grant has been supplemented with Part B discretionary funds. The focus is on technology in rural areas with distance learning.
Pennsylvania	x	x		
Tennessee	x			Although specifically a statewide school reform initiative, discretionary funds are used to support inclusive school projects and to support regular classroom teacher training. Discretionary funds support the "Make A Difference Project" in which general and special education teachers and administrators are trained to use strategies to deal with children with behavioral disabilities.
Connecticut	x			Part B discretionary funds support the piloting of a Strategies Intervention Program to determine the impact on student outcomes on the Connecticut Mastery Test. Discretionary funds also support technical assistance to districts regarding extensive administrative, instructional or curricular changes.
Florida				The SEA has supported focus groups of parents of children of students with disabilities. The purpose of these focus groups was to determine the extent of their involvement on School Improvement Teams. The SEA has also developed training for School Improvement Teams on "School Improvement for Special Needs Children."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Support for staff development for general education personnel (teachers or principals) to work with students with disabilities				
STATES	**DISCR**	**ADMIN**	**FLOW**	**EXAMPLES**
California		x	x	Part B funds (along with early childhood and Part D) have supported major Research, Development, and Demonstration Programs. These projects, run by state universities, were originally designed to address three areas. These three areas were assessment, prevention, and alternative service delivery. The RD&D projects have developed models and tested them. A final report on these models, including evaluation, is due in summer, 1995. A focus of these projects is on providing staff development to school personnel working with students with disabilities. Also funded with administrative Part B funds, along with other resources, is training of local personnel through California Educational Innovations Institutions (CEII). This training is conducted on a variety of topics.
New Mexico	x	x	x	A number of local applications have identified staff development for all staff, including general education. For example, these training efforts may include diversity, singular systems, and inclusion. SEA staff, supported by Part B administrative funds, have planned and supported conferences, workshops, and institutes that have encouraged general education participation. LEA projects have involved pre-referral staff development for general education personnel.
Iowa	x	x	x	The Iowa Behavioral Initiative has involved general education personnel including teachers and principals. An inclusive education conference, supported by Part B discretionary funds and facilitated by SEA Part B funded administrative staff, will be carried out in summer, 1995.
Illinois	x	x	x	Illinois has been implementing a Regular Education Initiative for the past several years, supported by state and Part B funding. School based teams are provided in-depth training. In addition, training is provided at the district and building level. At least 5% of flow-through funds must be used for personnel development. Parts H, D, and C funds are also involved with training efforts.
Michigan				
Pennsylvania	x		x	The Instructional Support Team Project provides training and assistance to teachers, principals, and other educators to work together to identify effective instructional procedures and to manage the continuum of services for students who are at risk for school failure.
Tennessee	x			Discretionary funds continue to be utilized to support CSPD training for principals, including topics such as student discipline and inclusion.
Connecticut	x			Training is supported regarding the development, implementation, and monitoring of special education programs. Connecticut's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Council (CSPD) is allied with Connecticut university preservice and graduate programs, specifically through a program called the Deans' Symposium. Comprehensive training programs for principals are conducted to assist them in the task of interfacing and integrating general and special education programs. The Strategies Intervention Program instructs regular and special education personnel in techniques designed to assist students in regular education and to thus avoid referral to special education.
Florida	x	x	x	Principals and general education teachers participate in staff development supported by the SEA. The SEA has initiated a Collaborative Training Initiative (CTI) in which teachers of special and general education are trained together to provide additional tools for student diversity. Several models/strategies are utilized: Strategies Intervention Model (SIM), social skills, cooperative consultation, PASS materials, and Balance (a Florida-developed system of integration of direct instruction and whole language instruction). The SEA also supports an Exceptional Student Education Leadership Training Institute, and training activities and products based on focus groups with site-based personnel. Through an extensive Alternative Training Initiative, out-of-field teachers throughout the state have access to training toward certification in special education. Training for regular education personnel is a major component of services for the statewide Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System which provides support services to school districts. Exceptional education has been involved in the development of "accomplished practices" for all personnel, including those working with students with disabilities.

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Support for pre-service training projects focused on increasing the skills of general education personnel to work with students with disabilities.				
STATES	DISCR	ADMIN	FLOW	EXAMPLES
California			x	LEAs are providing support to general education teachers receiving special education students.
New Mexico	x	x		Part B discretionary funds have been combined with Part D training funds to support pre-service training within the five state universities that prepare staff. Community meetings involve faculty from different university programs to get feedback from the community regarding issues such as how to deal with more diverse students in general education classroom, cultural differences, etc. Part B supported SEA staff facilitate these activities.
Iowa		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds provide on-going support of preservice training efforts, including CSPD activities.
Illinois	x	x		Although Part B has provided little support of pre-service training, state and discretionary Part B supported training has been facilitated/carried out by Part B supported SEA staff and others regarding the Regular Education Initiative with the intent of impacting pre-service training of teachers and administrators. Part B discretionary funds and Part H funds have also been utilized for University faculty training (mainly community college level) in the area of early childhood.
Michigan				
Pennsylvania	x		x	
Tennessee	x			Although Part B funds are not utilized directly for pre-service training, discretionary funds support college credit for workshop participants, including teachers on waiver and regular education teachers seeking special education certification.
Connecticut	x			Discretionary funding supports an interdisciplinary program across Connecticut's institutions of higher education on best practices in early intervention, special education, and inclusive education through institutes and distance learning technology.
Florida	x	x	x	Part B funds have supported the development of university/district regional partnerships to identify pre-service and inservice training needs.

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Interagency coordination activities

STATES	DISCR	ADMIN	FLOW	EXAMPLES
California		x	x	RD&D training is supported by SEA staff, as well as Regional Coordinating Councils. SEA staff also participate in activities of the California Youth Authority involving interagency coordination. In addition, SEA staff participate in interagency coordination activities as a part of the California Youth Authority.
New Mexico	x	x	x	Interagency planning has resulted in the development of a set of transition procedures for three year olds. The transition grant involving secondary students is focused on interagency collaboration. SEA staff funded by Part B have facilitated these efforts. They are also trying to work with both mental health and detention providers to coordinate statewide services. Approximately one third of the LEAS are utilizing Medicaid. SEA staff work with these LEAs. SEA coordination activities in the area of preschool involve four different agencies, e.g., administering a singular child development license. Preschool demonstration projects also involve collaboration with Head Start. SEA staff supported with Part B administrative funds have also worked on interagency efforts to coordinate the delivery of related services. For example, they are trying to influence the training curriculum for speech language pathologists and PT/OT therapists to emphasize working with classroom teachers (indirect as well as direct service). A technical assistance document and training have been jointly planned and delivered with bilingual education personnel at the state and local level. SEA special education staff have also worked with bilingual education with unified accreditation, and culturally appropriate assessment.
Iowa	x	x	x	The ISEA carries out a number of interagency activities on an on-going basis. One example has involved collaboration with Juvenile Court Service managers and the Iowa Council of Administrators of Special Education in addressing issues of safe schools and violence in the schools. SEA staff are working with Vocational Rehabilitation to improve transition services for older students with disabilities. The Iowa Behavioral Initiative has also focused on interagency coordination. The Iowa Transition Initiative brings together Job Services, Economic Development, education, and the Job Training Partnership Act personnel.
Illinois	x	x	x	SEA staff supported by Part B discretionary funds participate in various interagency activities, including Part H planning and implementation (state council, 45 local councils). Part B discretionary funds support in part 68 Local Transition Committees and a state level Coordinating Council, with an annual report to the Illinois legislature. Part B discretionary and Part B administrative (staff time) funds also support Local Area Networks for the development of "wrap around" services involving education, mental health, and family services. Other interagency activities supported by Part B funds include EBD projects and a statewide technical assistance center. The State Advisory Panel is supported by Part B funds, and represents several agencies, as well as other state level advisory bodies; e.g., Hearing Impaired, Behavior Disordered Council). The Illinois Services Resource Center for HI/BD youth works across several agencies. Medicaid recoupment endeavors are also funded by Part B-funded staff.
Michigan	x			Although not specifically referred to as education reform, funds are provided to mental health and other state agencies to support interagency activities.
Pennsylvania	x		x	Part B discretionary and flow-through funds are supporting the Pennsylvania Interagency Support Project and the Statewide Support Initiative. The Instructional Support System of Pennsylvania coordinates data systems to meet information needs of the Departments of Education and Public Welfare. The Family Focused Early Intervention System is a collaborative effort between the SEA, Department of Public Welfare, Office of Mental Retardation, and the Department of Health.

Tennessee		x	x	SEA staff funded by Part B administrative funds are involved in a number of interagency activities, including the Department of Youth Development and the Department of Children's Services.
Connecticut	x			The Family and Community Alliance Program is a collaborative project between the Department of Children and Families (DCF) and the Hartford Public Schools. Youth eligible for services are adolescents who are in DCF custody and who are special education students of Hartford Public Schools. The purpose of the program is to return target population students from residential treatment centers to less restrictive care in their home communities and to prevent the placement of youth who are at risk of out-of-community care.
Florida	x	x	x	The SEA is supporting 18 Diagnostic Learning Resource Centers in the state. These Centers provide support and assistance to LEAs and are involved in interagency coordination activities. The SED Network also has an interagency coordination focus involved in case management, case reviews, and support for maintaining students with severely emotional disturbance in the community. The Florida Shared Services Network has an interagency focus to assist school districts in bringing together a Kids Network. The Bureau has also implemented an Integrated Service Delivery Project that is exploring expanded ways of providing student support services including school psychologists helping teachers assess students with curriculum based assessment procedures. Florida's Strategic Plan takes the position that interagency coordination/collaboration is essential to providing the needed programs and services for students with disabilities and their families.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Programs, projects, or activities that relate to increased coordination between special education, Chapter 1, other support programs, and general education				
STATES	**DISCR**	**ADMIN**	**FLOW**	**EXAMPLES**
California		x		SEA special education staff participate in a study group of consultants within the Department of Education.
New Mexico		x		The SEA has initiated coordinated accreditation procedures (blend of monitoring and other activities) across programs, including special education. The SEA is also involved in planning a singular application (as part of their efforts under the Improving American Act. IDEA is conceptually involved in this effort. There are also other Department-wide efforts involving strong collaboration across programs and funding sources. For example, a preschool coordinated initiative has been implemented involving programs supporting children birth through eight, including a singular license.
Iowa	x	x	x	All three Part B funding sources have supported activities focused on increased program coordination. SEA staff participate in Department-wide staff meetings and planning efforts. An important goal of the RSDS statewide initiative is increased collaboration between general and special education.
Illinois	x	x	x	Illinois' ongoing Regular Education Initiative focuses on increased collaboration and integration of general and special education.
Michigan		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds provide liaison activities to other education office with the aim of increased collaboration and coordination. The SEA special education unit provides funds to general education for staff development. To receive state professional development dollars, LEAs have to identify other sources (special education, Chapter 1) for support. This emphasizes the need for program coordination.
Pennsylvania	x	x		
Tennessee	x	x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate in intra-agency coordination activities; e.g., special education, vocational education, general education, etc.
Connecticut		x		Bureau staff are assigned as liaison to the Bureau of Research and Teacher Assessment, the Bureau of Evaluation and Student Assessment, the Bureau of Curriculum and Instructional Programs, and the Bureau of Early Childhood and Student Services for the purpose of developing interdepartmental initiatives and cooperation. One result of these activities, was a consolidated ESEA-IDEA grant application which was forwarded to all local public school districts for utilization in the 1995-1996 fiscal year.
Florida		x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds participate in Department-wide activities to promote additional coordination across programs and are members of Inter-Bureau Teams that address specific issues. They have also been involved in regional capacity building for improved coordination of resources across programs.

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Parental involvement initiatives				
STATES	**DISCR**	**ADMIN**	**FLOW**	**EXAMPLES**
California		x	x	The SEA supports several parent groups. These parent groups exist to give advice and promote resource sharing throughout the state.
New Mexico	x	x	x	All SEA supported initiatives include parent/family involvement in the planning. Part B discretionary and flow-through funds are used to support this participation
Iowa	x	x	x	A parent-educator partnership is supported with Part B discretionary funds in each Area Education Agency. One parent and one educator are hired from Part B funds at the state level to coordinate and provide leadership for the parent-educator projects at the AEA level. Staff development activities involve parents of general and special education students. Each AEA has a parent and an educator that are members of a Statewide Council that works together on various activities, including sponsoring an annual conference of parents and educators. Parent educators and Statewide Councils work to promote parents as partners and to communicate parental concerns.
Illinois	x	x		SEA staff supported by Part B administrative funds plan and carry out workshops for parents. Part B discretionary funds also support parent training around the state. Parent mentors and parent liaisons are placed in each region for birth-5 services. Administrative and discretionary funds also support a statewide parent weekend for families, with a focus on parents/families of children birth-5. LEA activities supported by through funds also include parent/family involvement. The SEA helped to sponsor the annual Parent Institute held through the Illinois School for the Deaf and the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired.
Michigan	x	x		Michigan has two TAPP project that focus on parent training, including inclusive school benefits/strategies and other topics.
Pennsylvania	x		x	Part B funds are supporting the Family and Education Support Council and the Parent Mentor Program.
Tennessee		x		SEA staff funded with Part B administrative funds provide parent training, as well as parent consultation. One of the state initiatives is the Parent-Professional Partnership training.
Connecticut	x			The Parent Educator Partnership Program makes available trained parent volunteers to provide peer to peer support, technical assistance, and resource information for parents of children with disabilities
Florida	x	x		A Parent Advisory Group (in addition to the SAC) has been started this year. The SEA supports parent/professional training in which co-training is provided. SEA staff also provide liaison activities between parent groups, the State, and LEAs. Florida's Strategic Plan has a strong priority for parent involvement. SEA staff includes a position whose primary responsibility is parent services. Parent services are also a major component of the statewide FIDLER network.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Studies of the state special education funding system, state policies regarding pre-referral intervention, coordination between general and special education, etc.

STATES	DISCR	ADMIN	FLOW	EXAMPLES
California		x	x	California is involved in a major funding model change. A joint committee, Concept Team, is drafting proposed changes. This Concept Team is supported by SEA staff, educators, and others throughout California. SEA staff interface with other state agencies and general education regarding the work of this Concept Team. California legislation requires a new funding change. A model should be in place by July, 1996.
New Mexico	x	x	x	There have been a number of efforts in this area during the past two years, including Part B discretionary, administrative, and flow-through funding support of contracting, research, and staff involvement. For example, they have carried out a study of special education funding. Discretionary funds have also supported inclusive education activities (in support of NASBE recommendations). The SEA is also prioritizing more research on the impact of service delivery to students with disabilities.
Iowa	x	x	x	The AEA Directors are currently sponsoring/facilitating a study of the State special education funding system. Several studies of the RSDS statewide activities have been supported with Part B. All three Part B sources support special studies.
Illinois	x	x		Discretionary and administrative (staff support) Part B funds have supported planning of changes to the State Special Education Funding System, e.g., study of the costs of providing special education. A task force was supported to oversee this planning effort. An outside consultant was also contracted to assist with this funding study.
Michigan	x	x		Discretionary and administrative (staff support) Part B funds are used to support School Improvement Teams.
Pennsylvania				
Tennessee		x		During the past couple of years, there have been concerns that their state funding system promotes more restrictive placements. SEA are carrying out activities to develop a proposal for changes to the State Board of Education.
Connecticut	x			Currently, a legislative proposal is being reviewed by the Connecticut general assembly which would incorporate the current separate special education funding formula into the general education aid formula.
Florida		x	x	The SEA has implemented activities to study and change the state funding system that is very categorical with 15 cost factors. The revised system moves to five weights of students based on services. The revised funding procedures are being piloted in 20 schools. Next year, the number of schools piloting the revised funding procedures will increase from 20 to 80. Florida's Strategic Plan calls for a seamless system of service delivery through a committed alliance.

Uses Of Part B Administrative, Discretionary And Flow-Through/Set Aside Funds For School Reform: Support of projects that support inclusion of students with disabilities in general education

STATES	DISCR	ADMIN	FLOW	EXAMPLES
California		x	x	SEA staff facilitate waivers allowing personnel to serve in different functions. LEAs carry out prevention projects.
New Mexico	x	x	x	The SEA has supported a cost study of inclusive education with administrative funds. Flow through and discretionary funds have supported summer institutes on inclusive school issues and strategies. Conferences and workshops supported by Part B discretionary and flow-through funds have been co-sponsored by 3-4 other organizations; e.g. Inclusion Institute with TASH, Annual Preschool Institute with CEC Early Childhood Division, etc.
Iowa	x	x	x	A statewide Inclusion Network is supported by the SEA and AEAs throughout the state. An inclusion conference will be provided this summer, facilitated by Part B funded (administrative and discretionary) SEA and AEA staff.
Illinois	x	x	x	The ongoing Illinois Project Choices and Early Choices have been supported by all three Part B funding sources--administrative, discretionary, and flow-through; e.g., training, support of demonstration sites, and local implementation. Three-year "systems change" grants are funded through these sources.
Michigan	x	x	x	The SEA has provided discretionary grants to LEAs for School Improvement Teams (inclusive school efforts) and has provided technical assistance funds to LEAs. SEA staff supported by Part B discretionary funds have managed and facilitated these efforts. LEAs are implementing inclusive school strategies such as team teaching, co-teaching, etc.
Pennsylvania	x		x	GATEWAYS is supported with Part B discretionary funds and is a best practices and integration initiative. Its activities are intended to facilitate the inclusion of students with severe disabilities by training school district teams in state-of-the art educational strategies.
Tennessee	x			Part B funds are currently being used to support inclusive school programs across the state as well as workshops/conferences, etc., in this area. The Inclusion Task Force is also supported with Part B funds.
Connecticut	x			The Parent Educator Partnership Program makes available trained parent volunteers to provide peer to peer support, technical assistance, and resource information for parents of children with disabilities Regional Inclusive Education Resource/Support Teams are supported. Discretionary funds support the Strategies Intervention Program that helps individual students succeed in general education classrooms
Florida	x	x		The SEA has implemented a Florida Inclusion Network which includes four resource persons to provide information and assistance as well as seminars and workshops regarding inclusive school best practices. The Network also includes regional advisory groups. The SEA has also supported the implementation of an Assistive Technology Network that includes four Assistive Technology Centers, including specialist assistance and updated equipment and strategies. The SEA, in partnership with teacher unions, the School Boards Association, and parent and professional organizations, has also developed an inclusive school philosophical framework statement which has been endorsed by a number of groups. This statement discusses what successful inclusion means, including the supports needed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE